

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/006,868

Applicant(s)

CABE, DERON C. MC

Examiner

John Windmuller

Art Unit

3724

All Participants:

(1) John Windmuller.

(2) Jeff Proehl.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4 March 2004

Time: 11:30am

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

7

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


Allan N. Shoap
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The following is the substance of the interview referred to in Part III above. Examiner called Mr. Proehl to discuss changing the term "adjacent" to --juxtaposed--, since --juxtaposed-- more accurately describes the relationship of the handle flange and the body flange, which are side by side, touching each other, as opposed to "adjacent" which means near each other, not necessarily touching..